posed to be less. The Inamdar can redress anomaly by introducing the Survey Settlement.

Mr. Chentsal Rao.—In the Madras Presidency the valuation which forms the basis for quit-rent was taken not with reference to what the Inamdar ought fairly to get from his tenants but what he actually got, and what on a liberal estimate (erring if at all in favor of the Inamdar rather than in favor of Government) he might get within a reasonable limit of time in the future. There was thus no cause for complaint there.

Dewan's reply.—The point was fully considered by Mr. Rangacharlu when he issued the present liberal rules. It yet remains to be proved that the present rules are not sufficiently liberal.

Subject No. 179.

Excess areas within specified and identifiable sannad boundaries of Inams.

Summary of discussion.—The third and last reason is that excess areas found within the specified and defined boundaries of grants are brought to book.

Dewan's reply.—This is never done. The Government considers it so wrong to do this that respect to boundaries specified and identifiable has been most strictly enjoined.

Subject No. 180.

Government should share cost of repairing Inam tanks in a series except in the case of Sarvamanyam.

Summary of discussion.—In re tanks belonging to alienated villages,

(*a*) Where a tank is in a series, the Inamdar is required to bear the full cost of repair as estimated for by the Public Works Department. But when the village was granted as Inam, a portion of the beriz was given as Inam, and the remainder levied as a jodi. The cost of repairing the tank should be distributed between Government and Inamdar in the same proportion.

(*b*) In the case of Kayamgutta villages, Government have not remitted any portion of the Gutta which was originally fixed with reference to the beriz. Therefore the Government should bear the entire cost of repair with contributions from the raiyats according to rules. Relief should be granted as has been granted in the case of Kodagi Inams.

(*c*) In Sarvamanya villages alone, the cost of repairing the tank should fall entirely on the Inamdar.

Dewan's reply.—It is not in every case in which an inamdar or Kayamguttadar's tank is in a Tank-series that Government interferes. It interferes in those cases only where the neglect of the Inamdar to maintain his tank has caused it to deteriorate to such an extent as to endanger the Government tanks below. If in such cases it is argued that the Government should share with the Inamdar, the cost of repairing

and restoring the tank to a standard of safety, it will follow that Government is liable to maintain all Inamdars' tanks in proportion to the jodi which it receives in each case. This is of course absurd. The governing principle is this. The Inam was granted on the understanding that the Inamdar should maintain the irrigation work and enjoy the lands subject only to the payment of a jodi. In this view the concession asked for cannot be granted on principle or as a rule. At the same time there may be cases (and such are sometimes met with) in which the cost of repairing a tank falls with undue weight on the Inamdar and there are circumstances which call for help from Government in one way or another. Favorable consideration has been granted in such cases, and will continue to be granted when the circumstances justify it. In this respect the Kayamguttadar is not in a different position from the Jodidar.

Subject. No. 181.

There should be no rule of limitation in regard to revenue due by raiyats to Inamdars.

Summary of discussion.—There is no rule of limitation in respect of revenue due from raiyats to Government. The same exemption should be made applicable to revenue due by raiyats to Inamdars.

Dewan's reply.—The Sarkar has to administer a large tract of country and collect its revenue from several hundreds of thousands of tenants through the agency of a very large number of subordinate officials. Therefore rules of limitation cannot safely be applied to Sarkar revenue though as a matter of fact the Sarkar does not too rigorously enforce its demands for old debts. The case is different with the Inamdar who has a very small number of tenants to deal with and can easily recover his dues in time.

Subject No. 182.

Separate working of Inamdar's toddy revenue.

Summary of discussion.—Under existing rules and practice, an Inamdar cannot establish a shop and sell toddy. The effect of this is to place him at the mercy of the Government contractor. Therefore one of two courses should be adopted, *viz.*, (*a*) Government should farm the Inamdar's toddy revenue in the same way as it does its own, and pay the Inamdar after recovery from the contractor, or (*b*) the Inamdar should be authorized to pay as usual.

Dewan's reply.—This is an application that the Inamdar's toddy revenue should be separately worked; such a system is not workable, but a solution on some other lines will be attempted. The contractor should make the usual payments of course to the Inamdar in the meantime.

Subject No. 183.

Supply of survey papers of Inam village to Inamdar.

Summary of discussion.—Inamdars pay the cost of the survey of their villages. Therefore as in Government villages, the Maps, Súd, Akarband and Tipné should be given to the Inamdar to enable him to know the area, assessment, rate and boundaries of his inam village.